

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed January 3, 2006. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1, 11, 16, and 21-25 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on October 12, 2005. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on December 12, 2005. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on January 3, 2006 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action can be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 16-18, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jungck, et al. Independent Claims 1, 11, 16, and 21 recite in general the ability to process packets in a gateway having a multi-processor environment, receive a set-up request packet for a communication session, initially processing the set-up request packet to determine which of a selected one of a plurality of processors in the gateway is to handle the set-up request packet, and directly route in the gateway subsequent packets associated with the communication session to the selected one of the plurality of processors in response to the virtual identifier without performing the initial processing. By contrast, the Jungck, et al. patent performs initial

processing of all packets entering its router 702 by a packet analyzer/network processor (712, 804, 906A, 906B) before passing the packet to another processor, coprocessor, or external device for packet processing. Thus, the Jungck, et al. does not directly route packets in the gateway to a selected one of a plurality of processors without performing initial processing as required by the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-6, 11, 12, 16-18, 21, and 22 are not anticipated by the Jungck, et al. patent.

Though not specifically stated, it also appears that Claims 10, 15, 20, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jungck, et al. The Examiner indicates that the features of Claims 10, 15, 20, and 25 are inherent in the Jungck, et al. patent. However, as pointed out above, Independent Claims 1, 11, 16, and 21 are patentably distinct from the Jungck, et al. patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10, 15, 20, and 25 are patentably distinct from the Jungck, et al. patent.

Claims 7-9, 13, 14, 19, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jungck, et al. in view of Kashyap. Independent Claim 1, from which Claims 7-9 depend; Independent Claim 11, from which Claims 13 and 14 depend; Independent Claim 16, from which Claim 19 depends; and Independent Claim 21, from which Claims 23 and 24 depend, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Jungck, et al. patent. Moreover, the Kashyap patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with the Jungck, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7-9, 13, 14, 19, 23, and 24 are patentably distinct from the proposed Jungck, et al. - Kashyap combination.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
062891.0662

PATENT APPLICATION
10/034,232

13

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$790.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

CONCLUSION


Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', is written over a horizontal line.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

January 12, 2006

Correspondence Address:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, Texas 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073